

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 24 and 27 have been amended.

### **Rejection of Claims 24 and 27-30 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 24 and 27 have been amended, such that the claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

### **Rejection of Claims 1-18 and 20-33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over White In View of Saulpaugh**

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 as amended recites a method for a mobile agent object to discover services available in a host-computing environment. The mobile agent object migrates from a first electronic device to a second electronic device comprising the host environment. After the mobile agent object migrates to the second electronic device, the mobile agent object requests a service listing from the host environment, the host environment returning a service listing to the mobile agent object in response to the request for the service listing. The mobile agent object determines if a particular service is within the returned service listing, and the mobile agent object requests the particular service if the particular service is determined by the mobile agent object to be within the returned service listing.

The Examiner acknowledges that White fails to teach, among other things, a mobile object discovering services available in a host-computing environment.

However, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Saulpaugh fails in any manner to teach or suggest a method for a mobile agent object to discover services available in a host-computing environment. In no manner does

Saulpaugh teach that the client referenced by the Examiner is operable to request a service listing from the host environment, determine if a particular service is within a returned service listing, and request the particular service if the particular service is determined by the mobile agent object to be within the returned service listing.

Rather, and as asserted by Applicant's attorney in a previously submitted paper, Saulpaugh teaches hooking up "business logic" from one computing machine to another, analogous to a telemarketing system with a telephone directory at one location allowing the telemarketing system to make telephone calls to one or more other locations. Saulpaugh, at col. 23, line 23 to col. 24, line 4 teaches that a gate name may allow clients and services to migrate about a network and still work together. This is one way in which the teachings of Saulpaugh enable a key objective of the Saulpaugh disclosure, as stated at col. 7, lines 8-9, that "thin" clients have a mechanism for finding and invoking distributed applications or services. However, there is simply no example or embodiment taught by Saulpaugh wherein a client or object migrates to a device on which a service or service listing is implemented and requests the service while being hosted by the same device implementing the service. It appears very clear to Applicant that Saulpaugh teaches only that a client implemented on a first machine employs a gate name to access a service on a second machine and does not access a service on the first machine on which the client is implemented. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

It further appears clear to Applicant's attorney that the "client" discussed in columns 47-48 (which the Examiner apparently regards as a mobile agent object operable to request a service listing, determine a particular service, and request a service) is merely a cellular phone, personal digital assistant, or other electronic device that in no manner qualifies as a mobile agent object as specified in the claims. For example, referring to Figures 38-39 of Saulpaugh, and associated discussion, it is clear that the mobile client devices 1700, 1750 are electronic devices and not mobile agent objects having the limitations recited

in the claims. Further supporting this position is col. 47, lines 6-9 of Saulpaugh, which state “[i]n one embodiment, a client may request a listing, tree or other representation of all services advertised in the space. The user may then scroll or maneuver through the advertisements and select the desired service.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant’s attorney respectfully submits that scrolling menus are clearly associated with electronic devices rather than the mobile agent objects recited in the claims.

As such, White and Saulpaugh, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

### **Claims 14, 18, and 31-33**

Claims 14, 18 and 31-33 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 1.

### **Claim 8**

Claim 8 recites a host environment receiving a mobile agent object from a first electronic device, an audit system detecting a request for a service by a mobile agent object after the mobile agent object is received by the host environment, the service being implemented in the host-computing environment, the audit system generating an audit event in response to detecting the request, and the audit system logging the audit event in a database. As such, claim 8 is patentable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Moreover, Saulpaugh fails to teach or suggest detection of a request for a service, generation of audit events in response to request detection, or a database in which audit events are logged.

### **Claim 24**

Claim 24 is patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 8.

**Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20-23, and 25-30**

Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20-23, and 25-30 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 8, 14, 18, and 24.

**Rejection of Claims 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable  
Over White and Saulpaugh In View of Admitted Prior Art**

**Claim 19**

The admitted prior art fails to supply the teachings missing from White and Saulpaugh, as described with reference to claim 18 above. Thus, claim 19 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 18.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the claims prior to issuing an Office or Advisory Action.**

Respectfully submitted,  
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM<sup>PLLC</sup>

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. G. Scott Born', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

P. G. Scott Born  
Registration No. 40,523  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491